

005927

AN
OPEN
LETTER

To

ELDER A. G. DANIELS -----

AND AN

Appeal to the---

GENERAL CONFERENCE

By

J. S. Washburn
≡

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN
HERITAGE ROOM

Open Letter

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF S. D. A's.

A. G. Daniells,
President

Takoma Park, Washington, D. C.
December 26, 1921.

Dear Brother Washburn:--

It is now approaching a year since I received your letter written at Toledo, Ohio, February 10, 1921. On receiving your letter I wrote a reply at once, but fearing that it was not as carefully and kindly worded as it should have been, I laid it aside and wrote another letter. This did not suit me, so I never sent it. I really feared that I could not write you as plainly as I felt to be my duty without giving offence, so I let the matter rest just where your letter left it.

But of late I have been feeling that I ought to write you. Since the appointment of the day fasting and prayer, by the Fall Council, I have had much serious thought. I have been searching the Bible and the Testimonies for instruction as to how to observe such a solemn occasion acceptably to God. I find that to do so, one must examine his heart and life and put away everything revealed to him that is offensive to God, and He must not only come into full harmony and fellowship with his brethren. Having done this, he must then pray fervently with faith in the all prevailing name of Jesus, and the Lord will hear and answer his prayers.

Now, Brother Washburn, I am bent on doing my full part to make this day of fasting and prayer all that God wants it to be to me, to his people, and to this poor suffering world. As far as I can tell, I am in harmony and union with my Lord. I have put away everything that I know would separate me from Him. And now I want to do my part to come into full fellowship with my brethren.

As I review my relationship with brethren, I am conscious of a measure of estrangement between you and me. I confess that I do not possess that confidence in and brotherly love for you, that I once did, and that I desire to have again. I understand that this is your attitude toward me. How are you and I, members of His body, going to observe an acceptable fast to the Lord and offer up effectual prayer, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting while maintaining this attitude of estrangement? I don't know how we can.

It is these serious considerations that constrain me to write you at this time. I wish to tell you in all sincerity that I deeply regret the unfortunate difference that has come into our experience, and would gladly render any proper service in helping to blot it all out. I hold in high esteem and sacred memory your noble father and

Page two

sweet-spirited mother. In my boyhood days your father was my model preacher, and your mother's smiles put happiness in my heart many a time. I always put Calvin Washburn down in my account as 100 per cent Christian. I had the fullest confidence in his sincerity and fairness, and especially in his kindness and tenderness toward others. It was with this high regard for your parents, Brother Washburn, that I formed friendly association with you in England, when I came that way to the General Conference in 1900, a friendship that was maintained for years. And now it hurts me to find ourselves in such serious conflict.

Now the Scriptures tell us what to do when such situations arise. Leave thy gift at the altar and go to thy brother and be reconciled. This is in substance the instruction, Matt. 5:22, 23. First of all I wish to refer to myself. I understand that you have ought against me. But I do not know for sure what it is, as you have never told me. At least, I don't remember that you have ever come to me and pointed out any wrong that I have done you. I know that in Nashville years ago we had decided and rather serious difference of views regarding the question of the "Daily," but I can hardly think that you have allowed that to estrange you from me. If I mistake not, you assured me while you were in Philadelphia, at a later date that you were in good fellowship with me, and I know I was with you. I can not recall one unpleasant word between us since then. Really I do not know what my offense is that you hold against me. Will you be kind enough to tell me that I may deal with it?

But, Brother Washburn, I know of wrong on my part that I must clear up. It is this: I feel that I have been injudicious and too free and careless in my criticism of a serious wrong that I felt you have committed. I have not taken the matter up with you personally as the Scriptures instruct me to do. I have talked the matter over with others, and expressed severe condemnation of your course. This is not in harmony with my Master's counsel. I am sorry for this, and ask your forgiveness. My position as a minister does not excuse me. My official position in the cause does not give me license to do this. I am under solemn promise to my Lord to cease doing this sort of thing.

Criticism of one another has become all but universal among Seventh Day Adventists. It is a terrible evil in our midst. And the sorrow and shame of it is that ministers and conference officials of all classes take the lead. They set the example in this wicked thing. I know whereof I speak. I have traveled the world over, visiting Conference Presidents, Mission Superintendents, Institutional heads, and all lesser officials, and ministers and other workers. I know what my ears have heard. I know the time I have spent endeavoring to help workers to put away differences, and work together in union and brotherly love. I tell you, Brother Washburn, this free, easy destructive criticism is destroying us. It is robbing the leaders, chosen by the people, of the confidence of their associates and brethren they must have to advance the cause of God as they should. It is robbing the ministry of the power to work effectually. This cursed thing is blighting and withering every one and everything it touches, and it has become so easy and general that very little in this cause escapes it. When I was a lad, I never heard in my home, nor our church one word of criticism of our ministers who came to the West Union church. They were held by the boys and girls in the highest regard. It was then and there that I was led to count your sainted father 100 per cent true and good. To me he was God's man. So were Elders Butler, and Farnsworth, who came to us from Waukon. And we had the same esteem for the brethren and sisters. They were the saints of the Lord.

But how is it now? Criticism has wrought a terrible change. Scarcely a minister escapes the cruel thing. Men chosen to fill the sacred office of leadership are criticised about as freely by ministers and their children as though they were the most menial servants about the farm and shop. All and sundry are criticised at table, in private, and on the streets with little sense of the awful consequences that follow. The one direct result of this satanic thing is destruction of confidence. That accomplished ruin follows. As already acknowledge, I have not been altogether, in this thing, but as stated above I have set my heart on full deliverance. It is a terrible kind of bondage, but there is freedom for every one who will make the struggle. For one, Brother Washburn, I am determined to be right in the sight of a righteous and holy God. The days are evil. The sun is setting. The work to which I believe God has called me is sacred, and I am resolved to stand in his presence knowing nothing against myself. I must live with a conscience void of offense toward God and man. Now, I understand that the instruction in Matt. 5: 22, 23 means that when I bring my gift to the altar and there remember that I have ought against my brother, I am to leave my gift before the altar, and go to him for reconciliation. In view of this, is it not my duty to be as free in pointing out your wrongs as I am in mentioning and confessing my own wrongs? But I would frankly confess that I would much rather close this letter right her than to say one word about the wrongs I believe you have committed. However, I do not intend to dwell at great length upon this unpleasant part of this communication.

In that tract which you call "The Startling Omega and it's True Genealogy," you have seriously wronged a number of your brethren and it's True Genealogy," you have seriously wronged a number of your brethren. I consider it the worst tirade ever put in print by a Seventh Day Adventist minister against his fellow-workers. It is not only personal and bitter, but it contains statements that are not true--charges that you can never prove, and which can be proved false by an abundance of evidence. Thus you have borne false witness against not only your neighbor, but your brother in the Lord's family. One page 8, of that tract you say:--"When students of the College rise up and appeal for help from the College Board, against infidel teachers, forced upon them by General Conference men, it certainly is a pitiful, an appalling situation." I am free to tell you that not one teacher in Washington was ever forced upon that institution by Conference men. Proof of this can be furnished from the minutes of the Board which record the actions taken in selecting the teachers. Further proof can be obtained from prominent members of the Board whose veracity few, if any of our people would question.

You further state:--"Elder B. G. Wilkinson made a determined effort to free the College from the terrible influence of Dr. Alberts-worth and two other dangerous teachers. But these men, were all give a clear character as teachers by Elder Daniels, and Elder Wilkinson, because of his loyalty to the message and the Spirit of Prophecy, was forced out of office." In this paragraph are two untrue statements:

1.--That Elder Wilkinson made a determined effort to eliminate Dr. Alberts-worth, and two other dangerous teachers. I understand that the two "dangerous teachers" to which you refer are Brethren Lacy and Sorensen. It is possible that Brother Wilkinson and M. E. Olsen made an effort to eliminate Brethren Lacy and Sorensen, but it is not true that they attempted to remove Dr. Alberts-worth.

2.--That Elder Daniels gave all these men a clear character, and that "Elder Wilkinson because of his clear spiritual discernment and his loyalty to the message and the Spirit of Prophecy, was forced out of office."

Page four

This utterance is absolutely false, and it is an awful thing to say. How could you dare to launch such a charge upon our people wholly ignorant of the facts? I am bold to tell you all the records contradict these assertions. Further-more high minded men whose veracity can not be questioned will testify against this statement.

After making out a case with these false statements, you make the following appeal to our innocent people who do not know the facts in the case: "Shall men in high official station pollute the fountain head of missionary education, and expect God to bless this people while such terrible conditions exist at the headquarters of this denomination?"

To me this all seems very sad and unjust. My standard of morality, my ideals of the Christian life are so different that I am pained beyond words to express by this document. I have in my possession a copy of a letter written to you by Elder F. M. Wilcox, in which he points out very clearly a number of wrongs in this tract. This letter was written about a month prior to the date of your letter to me, and yet in your letter you say, "No one living can more deeply regret a personal attack, a bitter personal controversy. I am surprised and grieved that it should be taken as such." This, I understand, is a defense of the tract. You say, "Wherever I have seemed to do this evil thing, I ask God's forgiveness, and the pardon of my brethern." It is impossible for me to say how your letter can be considered a correction of the evils contained in that tract. However, I must leave that with you.

Besides these statements that are not true,--not according to the provable facts, your treatment of Professor Prescott seems most unchristian to me. How you can read this whole, bitter attack over, and then condemn Professor Prescott's sermons for having "no smiles, or tears of love or hope or joy" is beyond my understanding. Surely there are "no smiles, or tears of love or hope or joy" in this tract.

In closing, I wish to say that it is far from pleasant to me to write these criticisms. I do so wholly from a sense of duty. I long to put this whole painful matter out of mind forever.

I pray that God himself in His infinite love and wisdom and might may lead us all through to His everlasting Kingdom. He alone knows how to do it.

Yours with a sad heart,

(SIGNED) A. G. DANIELLS

To Elder Daniells

REPLY

920 Harding Drive, Toledo, O., May 1, 1922. Elder A. G. Daniells,
The Auditorium, Cor. Hayes and Larkin Sts., San Francisco, California

Dear Brother:--Your letter of December 26, 1921, was received January 7, 1922. I was surprised at that late date to receive an answer to my letter written nearly a year before, February 10, 1921. I had hoped for the courtesy of an immediate reply, but when several months had passed, I concluded that you had little or no interest in our reconciliation, and that you had fully decided to ignore my friendly appeal for a mutual understanding. For several months before I wrote that letter, I had understood that you were trying to have me brought before the Ohio Conference Committee, to stop my work, and failing in that, I was to be summoned before the General Conference Committee, and have my credentials taken from me. In fact, I was summoned on short notice, to leave my important meetings in the largest hall in Toledo, seating 4000 people, and come to Washington along, to answer for my statements in the tract, "The Startling Omega." When I telegraphed that my coming at that time would break up my work in Toledo, and that I could not come without witnesses, the matter was dropped for the time. Then in order to open the way for you to come to me alone, and tell me my fault, as Christ commands in Matt. 18:15, I wrote my appeal to you, Feb. 10, 1921, which you entirely ignored for nearly a year, thus manifesting not the slightest desire for peace or reconciliation.

In your letter, you acknowledge that you have been wrong in one thing, that is, that you have too publicly and severely criticised my tract, "The Startling Omega." And for that one thing you ask forgiveness. Certainly I grant your request. This is not a personal matter with me at all. That you have spoken against me to orders is comparatively a very slight matter. But, Elder Daniells, there are many other things beside that one thing, that only God can forgive. Those who are changing the doctrines of Seventh Day Adventists, sealed by the Divine Spirit of Prophecy, are committing a grievous sin against God and His people that God only can forgive, after true repentance.

All that you say in praise of my father and mother is true. My father was a faithful, firm believer in the original Third Angel's Message. He looked with horror on the "new" theory of the "Daily," and the whole brood of new doctrines that go with it, as held by Waggoner and Prescott, and by yourself. I have often heard you say that you were a firm believer in the new doctrine of the Daily. In fact I have that statement from you in writing. And my mother, the only living sister of Elder George I. Butler, regards with the utmost abhorrence all these new theories, and the vague, dreamy, spiritualizing teachings that follow them.

You deplore the flood of criticism that "has become all but universal among Seventh Day Adventists," and say, "And the sorrow and shame of it is that ministers and conference officials of all classes take the lead. They set the example in this wicked thing." You also say, "I have not been altogether free in this thing." From your own statements then, the sad truth is evident, that you being the highest "conference official," have set the highest possible "example in this wicked thing." You "call to remembrance the former days," when there was mutual love and confidence and practically no criticism. You are right in that statement, Elder Daniells. It was not so in former days. The administration of Elder Daniells, since 1909 is the SUPREME ERA OF CRITICISM. And "there's a reason: a fundamental, and unescapable reason, as inevitable as the solemn and awful statement of the Holy Spirit, 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'" It was not so in the days of

Elders James White, George I. Butler, O. A. Olsen, or G. A. Irwin. For they stood for the original message as sealed by the Holy Spirit of Prophecy. But you have defended and nourished men who have criticised the doctrines held by the pioneers, Great Controversy, Early Writings, and have yourself criticised the Spirit of Prophecy, and the Prophet of God herself.

In an all night talk on the train, going from Nashville to Memphis, Tenn., in 1910, you told me in defense of the Waggoner view of the "Daily", that the statement on page 75, of Early Writings, that, "When union existed before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the daily," was an imperfect statement. That it did not mean what it said, the correct view of the daily, but the correct view of the time. I replied that it said "the correct view of the "DAILY." You said, "No, it did not mean what it said; It was an imperfect statement. I replied that I did not believe there were IMPERFECT STATEMENTS in the Testimonies. You said there were many. Then you declared that you had seen many things, written in another man's handwriting, and which Sister White had never seen, going to be printed in the Testimonies. I answered that I did not believe that, for I had talked with Sister White all about that matter, and that she had told me that she sent out the last corrected copy, after it had been carefully read by herself, and that even if written in another man's handwriting, it went out under the sanction of the prophet herself. You said, "Did you ever see one of Sister White's sermons reported stenographically? It's a regular mess. You have to take this out, and put it in there, and fix it all over." You said "We had all we could do to keep Sister White from going with Dr. Kellogg, when the conflict was on, and that she had told Elder G. A. Irwin to put Dr. Kellogg down, and then she turned and put Elder Irwin down herself. That she had defended our people in Colorado for sending their tithe to J. E. White for the Southern work, instead of through the regular channels. That "she had caused the loss of thousands of dollars to the work." You said that recently she had taken the position, that in the South where there were strong Sunday laws, our people should do missionary work on Sunday, and not their ordinary labor; that At. T. Jones had answered her argument on this matter, and that we were finding it a most difficult matter to answer A. T. Jones; thus implying that A. T. Jones was right and that Sister White was wrong. In fact if I had believed all you said in your CRITICISMS of the Spirit of Prophecy, and of the prophet of God herself, I should have been convinced that the Testimonies were "imperfect", and that Sister White was changeable and utterly unreliable, and would have given up the Spirit of Prophecy to establish your new doctrines, that your new doctrines were absolutely contradictory to the Spirit of Prophecy, and would if believed, finally destroy faith in the Third Angel's Message. You can never deny these terrible criticisms that strike at the very foundation of our faith. They are burned into my very soul, and have been from that very moment and will be there till the day of judgment.

Sister White in a testimony dated Sanitarium, Cal., August 3, 1910, said: "I was pained to hear that Elder Daniells, knowing that there was a difference of opinion regarding the matter of the Daily, among our leading brethren, should urge this matter to the front, as was done in some places." In immediate connection with that statement, she said, "At such a time silence is eloquence." And yet straight on continually, the Waggoner view of the Daily was taught in Washington College, through the influence of Elder W. W. Prescott, and certain teachers who followed his lead as faithful disciples. W. A. Colecord, as a last monument of his labors, when he already despised the Spirit of Prophecy, under the tutelage of Elder Prescott, thrust three chapters on the "Daily", with it's absurd five-year sliding scale, that moves the whole prophetic framework of our faith, into Bible Readings, and that book is made the leading subscription book more widely sold by our canvassers than any other. You wrote my son that you did not teach the new doctrine of the Daily, since Sister White had said that "Silence is Eloquence." And yet under your sanction

and with your approval the whole tremendous machinery of this denomination is still pushing that Waggoner theory as the very heart of the Gospel. It works it's way into our readings for the week of Prayer, into the Manual for the Standard of Attainment examinations, into the Present Truth, and wormed it's insidious teaching into our last year's Sabbath School lessons, in such a manner that only those who were acquainted with it's desclating presence would recognize the eveil thing that comes as an angel of light. You have defended Elder Prescott and his followers in this teaching, and have even proposed to change Washington College into a high class University, with Prof. Prescott at the head of it and the other HIGHER CRITICS, of the original faith and of the Testimonies, associated with him.

At a recent Institute, you held up the Bible in one hand and the Testimonies in the other hand and said, "We do not test the Bible by the Testimonies, but we do test the writings of Sister White by the Bible. Therefore the Testimonies do not stand on the same level with the Bible." That is simply Higher Criticism. Suppose in the time of the Apostles, some one had said, "We do not test the Old Testament by the New Testament, but we do test the New Testament by the Old. Therefore the New Testament does not stand on the same level with the Old." Does such a conclusion follow? Certainly not. For after the New Testament has been proven by comparison to be the word of the Lord, it is then as truly the inspired, authoritative word of God as the Old Testament, and they stand on the same level. And when it is proven that the Testimonies bear the Bible test, then we know that they are inspired word of the Lord, as truly as the Bible and on the same level. The Bible is God's general word, for all time and for every people. The Testimonies are God's special word, for this special time and people. The Jews said, "We believe Moses but not Jesus or Paul. The truth was they did not believe Moses or they would have believed both Jesus and Paul. And the Seventh Day Adventist who does not believe the Testimonies to be ^{the} inspired word of the Lord, does not really believe the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of the Lord. The real proof that we believe the Bible is that we believe and practise the Testimonies. They come from the same God in Fulfillment of Bible prophecy. The Testimonies are not the word of Sister White but the word of the Lord. And God is not trifling with his people. He who doubts or disobeys the Testimonies the Testimonies is finding fault with God. The Pharisees were the higher critics of the word of the Lord. The same work of HIGHER CRITICISM is being done by some of our own ministers today.

When you and other leading men are thus criticising the Testimonies, and the very framework of our faith, what can you expect but a flood of criticism. When men tear down the strong assurance of a settled faith, they are left to follow the lead of those wise men who assume to know more than the prophet of the Lord, really more than the Lord himself. Then men begin to compare one wise man with another, and the inevitable logic is an ever increasing flood of controversy, protest and criticism. Whoever sows HIGHER CRITICISM, must expect to reap personal criticism. And when men who love the blessed old truths of the message, try to call men back to it, and protest against these innovations, they become offenders in your eyes and must be silenced or "crushed." But really Elder Daniells they are not critics but Protestants. You are the critics. For more than a year the principal theme in our papers and in our Institutes has been the terrible wickedness of criticism. We hear the most savage criticisms on criticism, from men who are determined to silence all protest. The very men who were appealing so pathetically against criticism, and comparing those who protested to "Cannibals," and their protests to "Damnable Hearsays," etc., etc., etc., were criticising me so bitterly and publicly, that members of the church in Toledo, Ohio, told me they had heard that the General Conference Commission was about to take away my credentials. And the Memorial Church in Washington,

which I organized and raised the money to pay for; will not allow me to preach there because of General Conference. "Hearsays" and criticisms. Somehow, "Hearsays" and heresies always go together. The men who think, and say that "Hearsays" are worse than heresies, seem to have both. For I know of no more bitter critics, than the General Conference men who have so much new light (?). They feel it their privilege to teach all manner of new theories, (really heresies) and if a man who loves the truth protests they talk pathetically against criticism, and then turn on the protestant with the most cruel criticisms. That which they regard in others as a terrible sin, is in themselves a virtue. A leading General Conference man at the New York Institute, preached a strong sermon on the usual topic, CRITICISM, and before he left the platform, uttered to a friend of mine one of the most malignant and malicious CRITICISMS on a brother that I have ever heard. It is as your letter states, "The sorrow and shame of it is that ministers and conference officials of all classes, (of the highest class especially) take the lead. THEY SET THE EXAMPLE IN THIS WICKED THING.

You and I were brought up in Iowa, within 20 miles of each other. We have been friends from boyhood. God has greatly blessed you in your work. In the great controversy against the "Alpha," you stood nobly for the truth. That you should stand so strongly for the truth then, and defend the "Omega" now, is a great sorrow to me. You state in your letter, "I confess that I do not possess that confidence and brotherly love for you that I once did." Now I do not say that I have lost my love for you Elder Daniells, for God knows I often pray for you. But for years my confidence in you has been slowly dying, until now it is dead beyond recall, beyond the hope of a resurrection. I am sadly forced to acknowledge that the astounding change in your attitude toward the Spirit of Prophecy and the Message, and toward your most loyal friends and workers has so completely destroyed the trust I once had in you that it can never be restored, except by a direct miracle of God.

The first intimation to me of recent developments in Washington, was a statement made by Sister White to me, in the home of Elder G. A. Irwin, now the home of Dr. Kress, at the General Conference of 1909. She said with a very sad look, "They are all tied up here in Washington, and there must be a great change." She told the General Conference Commission that Elder W. W. Prescott should leave Washington and do city work. He asked me if I would work with him in the large cities. I said, "Yes." But when about a year after, I told him I was ready to go, he answered me that he could not go, for the brethren were holding him in Washington to do literary work. So Elder Prescott has never obeyed that Testimony, but remained in Washington to edit the "Protestant," a channel of his new theology, until the "Protestant" died. I noted that you and others supported it to the very last. The "Protestant" is one of the many wrecks, not the last I fear, to be strewn along the path of the new theology. Elder Prescott's influence died with the Protestant. And I have never been able to discover that your influence helped him to obey that plain command of God, or that his influence has ever helped you. He might have been a tower of strength if he had obeyed the command of God. At the 1909 General Conference, you and others began an open campaign for the great new light (?) of the Waggoner view of the "Daily." Later on you carried it to the Union Conferences. At the Southern Union Conference in 1910, you and other taught it publicly. I went to you along as Christ commands, and appealed to you not to go off on that side track, that could only lead away from God and His truth. I had known and half believed some of these theories in England till I saw the awful ruin of some who hold them when I had renounced them forever. But you rejected my appeal.

Page eight

and it was at that time you made those startling CRITICISMS of Early Writings, the Testimonies, and of Sister White herself as stated above. This was the first break of confidence.

You have never been the same to me since. In 1911, I had made all arrangements in the regular way to work in Boston. I had been in Memphis, Tenn., three years, a city of less than 150,000 inhabitants, and wanted to work in the cities of the East according to the appeal in Vol. IX of the Testimonies. After all arrangements had been legally made, and I was about to go, you stepped in and blocked the way, telling the brethren that I was not suited for the work in Boston. Yet you had often stated that I was sent to Washington in direct answer to the special prayer of the General Conference Committee in 1902. No change had come, except that I had not accepted your new view of the Daily. The change was in you not in me. But in order to conform to rules of organization, I remained in Memphis two years longer than I ought to have stayed, till 1913, when I went to Philadelphia, against the protest of a member of the Gen. Conference Commission who told me he was sure they did not wish me to go to Philadelphia. It seemed they wished me to remain so long in the little city of Memphis, that I should wither and die as a worker and cease to be, for before the Daily controversy with you, I had many more classes than I could fill. While in Philadelphia, I had some private correspondence with Elder Prescott which he made public, and I was summoned before a committee in Washington, but when I was ready to go they refused to have me come. Then when the Protestant was dead, and you were doing city work, I did say to you that I was with you, that I was not against you. What I meant as you well knew, was in the matter of the evangelistic work in the cities. I was hoping that with the death of the Protestant, and you doing the work that Sister White asked Prof. Prescott to do, that influences that had affected you unfavorably might be broken, and that you might again be the power you once were in the Lord's work. You came to Philadelphia to preach at the great Garrick theater meetings, and in my house criticised Dr. Wilkinson personally so bitterly that I was astounded and gave up all hope.

There is one thing in your letter to which I object seriously. After the confession and seeming friendliness of the first part of your letter, you turn completely around in the latter part of the letter and make the strongest accusations of falsehood, that I have ever had made against me in all my life. You say, "Thus you have borne false witness against not only your neighbor, but your brother in the Lord's family." Thus your letter begins with confession and conciliation and closes with accusation and criticism. Now there is a fundamental principle in confession of sin that you have violated in this letter. In preaching on confession of sin to God and to one another, I have always told the people that if there is wrong on both sides, and one brother comes to the place where he is willing to acknowledge his own wrong, even if the other man has done the greater wrong, just to go first and confess your own wrong and that alone, not to say one word about the other's wrong. For it spoils a confession utterly to say, "Yes, I did wrong, but you did so much worse than I did that I am in a measure excused for the wrong I did you. I was wrong, but you were much worse than I." "Well," you may ask, "Should we not show our brother his wrong? Certainly, but at the proper time. And that time is not when you are making a confession. Confession and reproof should be wrapped in two separate packages. Confession, in package No. 1 and reproof in package, No. 2. First make your confession and see what effect it will have, and then go and administer reproof if necessary. Suppose I should say to God, "I have done

Page nine

wrong, but you didn't give me a fair chance." What would that confession amount to? Nothing at all. Suppose I should say to God, "I have done wrong, but you didn't give me a fair chance." What would that confession amount to? Nothing at all. Suppose I should have a difference with a brother, and should say to him, "I have been too critical against you, but you are an awful liar." My serious accusation completely nullifies my confession and turns it into an insult. It is like Joab, who took Abner to one side to speak "peaceably" to him, and who at another time took Amasa by the beard to kiss him, and smote both of them under the fifth rib and killed them. 2 Samuel 3:27 and 20: 9,10.

I will here repeat to you my letter of February 10, 1921.

"344, South St., Toledo, Ohio, Feb. 10, 1921.

Elder A. G. Daniells, Takoma Park, D. C.

Dear Brother:--I have recently heard that it is reported that I wrote a letter to some one in the West, stating that certain judgments had come upon Prof. W. W. Prescott and his family because of his teachings. I am perplexed by this rumor, as I do not remember writing such a letter. I deeply regret if I have made such a statement, with the meaning placed upon it that has come to me. The letter to C. E. Holmes dated April 18, 1920, was not intended for promiscuous circulation. At my request he printed 24 copies only, in loose leaf form; only a part of which have been received by others. No more have been printed by him since, and at my own request no more will be printed. It was the farthest thing possible from my thought in writing that letter to injure the brethren. No one living can more deeply regret a personal attack, a bitter personal controversy. I am surprised and grieved that it should be taken as such. What I intended to do strike was not men but principles that seemed to me to be wrong. To attack a fellow minister because of difference in doctrine, is Satanic and cruel. I desire in the minds of my brethren to be forever divorced from such a vicious purpose. Wherever I have seemed to do this evil thing, I ask God's forgiveness and the pardon of the brethren. I want this fact to be known as far as my letter has been read. Whatever in my communication, written or verbal, that has been unfortunate in statement or rash in expression, or to be apparently a thrust at any individual, I regret. My opposition has been intended against conditions, not individuals. As I review the whole situation, I can not retract or change in the least degree any position I have taken on the fundamental doctrines of the Third Angel's Message which I have always believed, and which have been held by the denomination from the beginning. Trusting in the mercy of our Heavenly Father, and the leading of the Holy Spirit, and believing that God's people will all see eye to eye in the closing of the work we love, I remain,

Your Brother in Christ,
(Signed) J. S. Washburn.

My letter is friendly. Not a bitter word. No charge or accusation of any kind. I did not accuse you point blank of lying. You ignored this friendly appeal nearly a year. I had time to die or be discouraged, a hundred times, without one word of counsel or help from the chief representative of the Lord's flock on earth. Then at last you come to me with a combination letter of confession and charge of falsehood. In my letter of February 10, 1921, I have made all the confession I ever expect to make in regard to my tract, "The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy." The terrible thing about my tract is that the facts as stated are all TRUE. When I said, "When students of the college must rise up and appeal for help from the College Board, against infidel teachers, forced upon them by General Conference men, it certainly is a pitiful, an appalling situation," I did not mean that physical, or legal force had been used, but that influence had been brought to bear upon the College to retain Dr. Albertsworth and the other teachers you mention in your letter. I can bring a score of the best men in official positions in the denomination who were present at a meeting where you brought in the three teachers named in your letter, and stated that you had talked with them and knew they were safe teachers. A few questions were asked them and they were pronounced sound in the faith. Thus you threw the tremendous weight of your influence as President of the General Conference, a sacred trust given you by our people, on the side of retaining them in the College work. That is what I mean by saying that you forced them on the College by giving them a clear character as teachers. We may call this a moral pressure. You have not forgotten this meeting where you thus gave them a clear character as teachers, and thus as far as your influence went, you with other General Conference men thus "forced them on the College", against the strong protest of those who desired a change. You favored continuing the influence of these teachers. Elder Wilkinson did not. Right then and there you brought pressure to bear on Elder Wilkinson to resign the office of President of the Columbia Union. He did resign for that reason, and the three teachers stayed another year. Thus you forced him out of office, and forced them on the College, against the wish of a number on the College Board. For the very next year all three were removed from the College faculty. Surely you know what I mean by the word "forced". It is not right for you to make that technical turn to prove that I am stating an untruth.

You acknowledge that Elder Wilkinson made a determined effort to free the College from the influence of the two teachers mentioned in your letter, but say it is not true that he tried to remove Dr. Albertsworth, and this is one of the falsehoods with which you charge me. It is true that at one special time he proposed to remove the two you mention, and said nothing about removing Dr. Albertsworth. He did not unfold his whole plan at that time. I was working with Elder Wilkinson in Charleston, W. Va., and he talked with me very freely about the College situation. I was in a position to understand his plan, better than yourself, Elder Daniells, for your long feud with him, coming to a crisis at that time, prevented him from opening up to you his whole plan. His plan to remove the two teachers you mention was preliminary to the removal of Dr. Albertsworth, who was to be removed later if necessary. And you yourself, Elder Daniells, knew that in the mind of Elder Wilkinson and others who desired a change in

the College situation, Dr. Albertsworth was classed with the other two doubtful teachers, and slated for removal on the same grounds. For at the very same time and manner when you took the other two into a meeting to defend them as teachers and to prevent them from being removed, you did the same work of defense for Dr. Albertsworth. You thus revealed that you know perfectly well that Dr. Albertsworth, was in the same danger of being removed as were the other two teachers. Or else why did you in the same time, place and manner, that you gave the other two a clear character, do the same work of defense for Dr. Albertsworth?

Yet in your anxiety to prove that I have stated an untruth, you make this technical turn to prove my words untrue. I can not look upon such tactics as honorable from any man, muchless from a man of your position and standing. By many witnesses of the highest standing, I stand ready to prove every statement in my tract. "The Startling Omega and It's True Genealogy," to be the truth and nothing but the truth. It stands unanswered and unanswerable, an eternal protest against the developing apostasy. And you desperate efforts to keep it away from the people, and from being read by our workers will only make them the more anxious to study it, to know the terrible truth, and be ready to meet the crisis we face today. From the sad facts stated in that tract, I again appeal to all our people: "Shall men in high official position pollute the fountain head of missionary education, and expect God to bless his people while such terrible conditions exist at the headquarters of this denomination?"

Personally I have nothing against Prof. Prescott. But I know that many will agree with me that his influence is a menace to this denomination, and that he is perpetuating the ruinous theories of Dr. E. J. Waggoner, in part at least, and that the people are not cheered or comforted or illuminated by his dim and complicated sophistry. No two men agree in all things, but on the heart, the core, the root, the seed theory of all our modern Washington new thought, and Adventist new theology, that is the new doctrine of the Daily, Dr. Waggoner and Prof. Prescott were one. In 1910, from Dr. Kellogg's Sanitarium, Dr. E. J. Waggoner wrote a letter to one of our ministers in which he said "I knew the view on the Daily that Prescott held in London, -----and do not see how anybody who has regard for the Scriptures can hold any other view." In 1898 I heard an all day discussion between Dr. Waggoner and Prof. Prescott on one side arguing for the new view of the Daily, and Elder J. W. Loughborough and Elder E. E. Andross on the other side for the Old original Adventist view. Prof. Prescott has often told me he regarded it as a great privilege to have sat at the feet of Dr. Waggoner as a learner, and that he had received from him great spiritual light. The new doctrine of the Daily and the Prescott new theology is a part of that light now shining through Dr. Waggoner's obedient pupil, and disciple, upon Washington and the denomination. Prof. Prescott has thus become the medium of that light, the connecting link between the Alpha and the Omega.

Many are breathing a sigh of relief that Prof. Prescott's Sabbath School lessons, so shadowy, mystical and complex are over, we trust to return no more forever. We welcome the simplicity and clearness of the new year's lessons. I know that Prof. Prescott's lessons were a cause of a lapse of interest in the Sabbath School, and thus directly

one of the causes of the shortage in the Sabbath School Mission funds. However my church in Toledo, Ohio, raised her quota of 60 cts. per week for Missions and a surplus over. Last year Toledo raised more than \$500.00 more than any church in Ohio for Harvest Ingathering, the great work of Foreign Missions. And I am loyal to the denomination, to the Mission work, and to the organization.

It is true that Prof. Prescott's teaching is depressing, that there are in his sermons, "no "smiles or tears of love, or hope, or joy." You state that there are none of these in my tract. My tract is not a sermon, but a necessary exposure of a terrible danger to our people and our work. If I were fighting desperately the attack of a wild and savage beast, or a venomous serpent upon my family or friends, I do not think there would be any "smiles or tears of love, or hope, or joy," in my words or deeds. And that was exactly what I was doing when I wrote that tract. I am not comparing any man to a wild beast or a dangerous serpent; I am not fighting any man in that tract. I am warring against deadly falsehoods, false doctrines that can only desolate and destroy." "For we wrestle not with flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

Elder Daniells, the Omega is not an invention of mine. You know this. God through the Spirit of Prophecy, has plainly foretold it: the most deadly, concealed, apparently spiritual apostasy of all the ages; closely related to the Battle Creek apostasy of twenty years ago, led by Dr. Kellogg, Dr. Waggoner, and A. T. Jones. As closely related to that as the first letter of the alphabet, Alpha is related to the last letter, Omega. In the alphabet of apostasy, the last, the climax, the greatest, the most subtle in all the terrible history of sin. No prophecy is clearer in the Bible or the Testimonies, than the prophecy of the OMEGA. The Alpha at the old headquarters, Battle Creek, the Omega at Washington. The Omega as much more dangerous than the Alpha, as Washington is greater and more influential than Battle Creek.

(1) THERE WILL BE AN OMEGA

Here is the proof in regard to the Omega, unanswerable to any Seventh Day Adventist: On page 50, Series B, No. 2, is the following statement by Sister White: "In the book, 'Living Temple' (by Dr. Kellogg there is presented the Alpha of deadly heresies. The Omega will follow and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given." On the same page she says: "But we must firmly refuse to be drawn away from the platform of eternal truth, which since 1844 has stood the test." This "deadly heresy" will change the original truth, and it is a startling fact that the new Daily doctrine moves nearly all our prophetic dates, and opens the way for other theories that draw men forever away from all the message of 1844. On page 53 this Testimony further states: "Living Temple contains the Alpha of these theories. I knew that the Omega would follow in a little while, and I trembled for our people." And further:--"One thing, it is certain is soon to be realized; the great apostasy, which is developing, and increasing and waxing stronger and will continue to do so until the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout." Series B, No. 7 p.57

(2) WHERE WILL THE OMEGA DEVELOP AND CENTER?

In one of the most terrible warnings that God has ever sent to this people through the Spirit of Prophecy, on page 211, Volume 4, of the Testimonies, "Satan's chief work is at the headquarters of our faith." Then the Omega must develop in Washington, for that is the headquarters of our faith. The Alpha centered and developed in Battle Creek, the old headquarters. The Omega must center in the new headquarters, Washington, D. C., the logical center, in harmony with the prophecy of Revelation 13th chapter, for the last struggle for truth and liberty. The Omega will develop and center in WASHINGTON, D. C.

(3) HOW WILL THE OMEGA DEVELOP?

The Testimonies answer this question positively. Vol. 4, P. 211, "It is the plan of Satan to weaken the faith of God's people in the Testimonies. Next follows skepticism in regard to the vital points of our faith, the pillars of our position, then doubt as to the Holy Scriptures, and then the downward march to perdition. This has been the logical course of every apostasy in our history, including the Alpha, and is a word picture of the developing Omega in Washington today. O, how sadly true that many in Washington, have gone a long way on that downward march. That program has been entirely completed by some, and many are on the way. When men begin to doubt and criticise the Testimonies, they only prove them true by fulfilling them. Prof. Perscott's deliberate and continued refusal to obey the Testimony to leave Washington and do city work, sanctioned by yourself and other General Conference men, the insistent and persistent pushing of the new Daily doctrine in our Washington publications, and Washington College, after the Testimony had said that on that subject, "Silence is eloquence," are a few among many other startling indications that this awful prophecy is fulfilling in Washington today.

March 29, 1908, from Sanitarium, California, the Lord through Sister White sent a message by you, to "all our people," in general, and particularly "to all the working forces" of Takoma Park, asking that a pledge be circulated on the subject of "flesh foods," tea and coffee," etc. You deliberately rejected this message from the Lord, and refused to deliver it to the denomination. Sister White had said, "I know whereof I am writing." You really contradicted her statement by telling her that our people would not sign such a pledge and that it would cause a division.

You further endeavored to free yourself from this terrible responsibility by getting other General Conference men to repudiate it with you. I have had for many years a copy of that solemn testimony in my possession, and I can but tremble when I think that egery command of God whether in the Bible or in the Testimonies, when thus deliberately disobeyed is a time bomb that in God's own time will explode under the feet of those knowingly and persistently disobedient, and bring them to sudden and utter ruin and desolation. Read this startling warning from the Spirit of prophecy, "When God sends a message to any person, minister or doctor, if men pursue a course to make of no effect the message sent,-----it would be better for those men if they had never been born." Series B, No. 7 P. 59.

When Dr. Albertsworth was on trial before the College Board, I heard him say that he was teaching in harmony with the Bible Institute that had been hel in Washington during the summer of 1919. When asked to state the teachings of that Institute, he said that Institute was secret, and that to reveal it's teachings would be a breach of confidence. That it was held for the benefit of the leading ministers and the educational leaders, and not for the ordinary ministers or workers or the common people. However in defense of his work in

the College, he would take the liberty to state that the (so called) Bible Institute taught that the Spirit of Prophecy was not inspired on history, and that some said neither on health reform, or theology. Just how much was left for the Spirit of Prophecy to be inspired on, he did not state. Thus under the authority, and sanction or permission at least of this so called Bible Institute, teachers were undermining the confidence of our sons and daughters in the very fundamentals of our truth, while the parents were not allowed to inquire into the sacred secrets of this private council. Was this council in harmony with the example of Jesus, who ever taught openly and in secret said nothing? Is such a conspiracy to destroy the faith of our children to be sanctioned and defended by our General Conference leaders? And is not a fact that not only the Inspiration of the Testimonies but many other fundamental truths such as the King of the North, the date August 11, 1840, "this generation" and the moving of the dates for the opening and closing of the 1260 years, and other foundation truths passed under the inspection and higher criticism of these wise doubters, and that it was the place to which "advanced" thinkers brought their various doubts for comparison and inspection. Was this calculated to strengthen the faith of our highly privileged leaders? One of our most faithful workers said the holding of this Bible Institute was the most terrible thing that had ever happened in the history of this denomination. A council, a diet of doubts does not give spiritual strength. We read in Luther's time of spiritual strength. We read in Luther's time of a Diet of Worms. This was a Diet of Doubts. Two of our best writers told me that articles on the Turkish question were kept out of our papers since that secret council had thrown doubt on that question and many others. So while Islam is gathering her millions for the last great fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 11th and 12th chapter, our papers, our ministers, our sentinels are chloroformed, to sleep, are muzzled into silence by this Council of Darkness, this Diet of Doubts. Was not this secret council a crowning act in the program of doubt and darkness and criticism that has been enveloping Washington recently? Will this bring the latter rain, the full assurance of faith and the victorious life? And you and Professor Prescott were the leading figures in that Institute. No doubt you found it impossible to agree with the new chaotic theology of that council, but Elder Daniells, how could you permit such a dangerous parade of doubts, and preside over such a cloud of misty higher criticism? Did that Institute cure the criticism you tell me is destroying our work? No, it multiplied it a hundred times. And you more than any other man are responsible. In Series B, No. 2, P. 38, is this Testimony. "Our brethren are not to be called to Battle Creek to hold a council for the examination of doctrines, while the men who profess to know the truth remain surrounded by a cloud of unbelief----- The remedy for many of these differences will be found in heeding the messages of counsel published in recent testimonies." How could you bear, or dare to do in the time of the Omega, the very thing which the Lord forbade in the time of the Alpha? Sister White is dead but her words, the words of the Living God, still live. She said that after her death that great changes would come. That prophecy is surely being fulfilled, and the Omega is developing with startling rapidity in the very manner and in the manner and in the very place that the Testimonies and the Message, and CRITICISM, both higher and personal. And what is the inevitable logic, the ultimate end? The Lord answers: Test. Vol. 4, p. 211, "When the Testimonies which were once believed are doubted and given up, Satan knows the deceived ones will not stop at this, and he redoubles his efforts till he launches them into open rebellion, which becomes incurable and ends in destruction. Satan has gained marked advantage at---(the headquarters) because the people of God have not guarded the outposts."

Nineteen years ago, July 23, 1904, Sister White wrote: I know that Elder Daniells is the right man in the right place." And again speaking of Elder

Prescott and yourself, the same Testimony says: If the men whom the Lord has chosen to stand in positions of responsibility, will heed the Testimonies that God has given and is giving, if they will separate from those who are binding up with worldly influences, they will be safe men for the times on which we have entered." Series B, No. 2, P. 41

(4) WHO WILL LEAD IN FORMING THE OMEGA?

The answer is plainly stated in the Testimonies. They will be men who have been specially mentioned by the Lord and trusted by His people. Vol. 4, P. 211 says: "The very men whose labors God has signified that he would accept if they were fully consecrated, have been the ones to be deceived, to fail in their duties, and to prove a terrible burden and discouragement, instead of the blessing and help they should have been. These men who have been trusted to keep the fort have well nigh betrayed it into the hands of the enemy. *THEY* have opened the gates to a wily foe who has sought to destroy them." Note, all italics in this letter, mine.)

Again, the Lord says through Sister White: Series B, No. 2 P. 16--
"Do not be deceived; many will depart from the faith giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. We have before us the Alpha. The OMEGA will be of a most startling nature." The Omega has startled me and my friends beyond expression. When I learned that you, my boyhood friend, and fellow laborer in the work of God, had actually gone to brethren, in your bitter campaign to destroy my influence as a worker, with the most serious charges against my moral character, with absolutely inexcusable slander, I was astounded. While in England, more than twenty years ago, when I partially believed the new doctrine of the Daily, and as Prof. Prescott and nearly all our leading men said, that Dr. Waggoner was the greatest Bible teacher in the denomination, and was in a measure under the hypnotic power of the teaching that developed into the Alpha, and later into the Omega, God saved me out of what might have been ruin, and taught me the deadly peril and awful danger that lurks in those Satanic theories that some men call "New Light." When you came to Washington in July, 1903, to find a place a Takoma Park for our headquarters, I told you all of that experience in England. You thanked God He had kept me, sent me to the camp meetings to open the campaign to establish headquarters in Washington, often said I had been sent to Washington in answer to prayer, took the leading part in making me Financial Secretary to raise the \$100,000.00 Fund, to build the headquarters in Washington, and defended me in every way if that

experience was mentioned. I have articles from your pen in my possession, still on file in Washington, D. C., after stating on pages 8 and 9 that I was on both the Sanitarium Board and the School Board, and Financial Secretary of each school boards have thought it wise for Elder J. S. Washburn to take the responsibility of soliciting funds. His whole soul is in the Washington work. The Lord has laid the burden on his heart." In the leaflet, "The Call of God," also on file as above, on Page 8, you speak of the wonderful experience with the Memorial Church, dedicated by Sister White, May 7, 1904, entirely free of debt, and say, "This is a remarkable record. It is unusual. The hand of the Lord is in it..... Indeed may it not be a foreshadowing of our future experience everywhere. God grant it." And yet you knew that the Lord helped me to raise every cent to buy that church. You often told me it was wonderful how God had helped me to buy the Memorial Church, the forerunner of the headquarters. On page 8 you speak of my work in raising the \$100,000.00 Fund as follows: "Brother Washburn, who has been chosen by the General Conference

Committee to carry the special and wearing burden of raising this money, is working early and late with a believing heart that the God of Israel will move on the hearts of his people to offer willingly for this work." You wrote these words of high recommendation in 1904 one year after you knew all about that experience in England on which you now base your charge of immorality. These words I have quoted and many others I might quote, written when you knew everything you know today of that experience, will stand as an eternal testimony against your cruel slander of today. You were either false when you so highly recommended me in 1904, or you are false today when you base a charge of immorality on that which you know, when you stated that God was with me. You may take either horn of the dilemma you choose. You were either false in 1904 or you were false in 1920 and 1921, and are today. For you have absolutely stultified yourself beyond all explanation or excuse in your desperate and cruel effort to destroy my influence, because I have forever renounced the Waggoner theology, a part of which you are defending today. You were my true and faithful friend until the Waggoner theology on the Daily gripped you, and you were in the coils of the Omega. Because God had given me in England a horrifying view into the pit of the Waggoner theology, and I could not go back into it to please you, then you go to the President of the Columbia Union and others with the blackest and most inexcusable slander. And I am sorry to say that there is abundant evidence to show that the present President of the General Conference has so far forgotten the sacredness of his high position, that others of his fellow workers faithful innocent and true, have also been slandered by him. You were the sould of honor and kindness until this false light dawned upon you, but now with infinite sorrow I can but say today, that in all my experience in the work of God, I have never known so bitter a critic, so cruel a slanderer. How could you like the evil servant in Christ's great prophecy thus cruelly "smite" your fellow servants. May God in His mercy open your eyes to realize the astounding and terrible change that has come into your spirit and life, and your attitude toward your faithful friends and workers, the Testimonies of the Holy Spirit, and the Third Angel's Message.

The Testimonies say, Vol. 4, P. 811, "Men of experience have seen stealthy hands slipping the bolts that Satan might enter; yet they have held their peace with apparent indifference as to the results." I dare not, I will not hold my peace. No power on earth shall silence my warning protest against the terrible evils that are threatening the very life of the work of God. My memory goes back to the power and blessing manifest in the early days of this movement. In my veins flows the blood of those who knew this Advent movement from it's infancy. On my father's and mother's side, the Washburns and Butlers, not only father and mother, but both grandfathers and grandmothers were pioneer Seventh Day Adventists. I will by the Grace of God go through with this people to the kingdom of God. You nor any committee can ever take away my credentials or stop my work. I stand just where my sturdy old warrior uncle, George I. Butler stood. If he were to rise from the dead he would stand with me against you and Prescott. I know that he feared that you and those who were following the Waggoner and Prescott theology were leading the work over the precipice to ruin, and you are near to that point as your letter confesses. I challenge investigation, not before a small committee, but before the whole General Conference. Read my tract, to the Gen. Conf., "The Startling Omega and it's True Genealogy," and let them decide who has told the truth. I will bring my witnesses and friends and have all the time I need to present my case. I am not at all afraid that the representatives of our people will turn my down or out for standing for the original Message and the Spirit of Prophecy. You tried to bring me before a small committee. I will gladly meet you before the whole General Conference.

I APPEAL TO THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

You will understand of course that when I say I appeal to the General Conference, that I formally demand a hearing before the present General Conference Committee before it has been changed by an election, all the foreign representatives, the presidents of local conferences, and as many others as either you or I may desire. I demand this hearing. First, Because you have slandered me as being immoral. Second, Because you have slandered me as being a liar. Third, Because you have slandered the Testimonies and the Spirit of Prophecy. I further give notice that if this hearing is not promptly granted before the present General Conference Committee, and others as stated above, I will place this reply together with your letter, as an Open letter in the hands of every delegate attending the General Conference and on you will rest the blame of publicity to all our people. This is not a personal matter but concerns the very life of the Messenger of Truth, in which every Seventh Day Adventist is vitally interested. It belongs to all the people.

I will never be railroaded out of the work by a private or a semi-private Inquisition. I appeal from your decision and that of a small part of the General Conference Committee who have condemned me as false, in my absence, without a hearing, fully conscious of what it may mean to me and to the truth of God. "For I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day." And I thank God I am not alone in this protest and appeal. Many will rally to the standard of the glorious, perfect, old time message of Truth, forever sealed by the Holy Spirit of Prophecy. Mist and doubts and darkness shall vanish before the light. These deceptive theories, this subtle science of evil that calls itself "New Light", shall go down and out into eternal oblivion, forgotten forever. And after the shaking, shall come the refreshing, the latter rain, and eternal victory. "The Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge.